Human Events *A Weekly Analysis for the American Citizen*
Combined with the Magazine ANALYSIS
Editorial Office 1710 Rhode Island Ave., N. W., WASHINGTON 6, D. C. *Telephone* NATIONAL 2066
VOL. VIII, NO. 47, *Issue Number* 408, NOVEMBER 21, 1951 ★ *Editor:* FRANK C. HANIGHEN ★ *Associate Editor:* FRANK CHODOROV

NOV 23 '51 LIBRARY

THE ETHICS OF FOREIGN POLICY

By Felix Morley

Men, or most of them at any rate, are endowed by their Creator with a moral sense. They possess an intangible organ, to which we give the name of "conscience", that distinguishes between the more and the less admirable choices in all the countless occasions of decision that occur in the lifetime of an individual.

Conscience may be strong to the extreme of obduracy, or weak to the point of impotence, but it is seldom or never altogether nonexistent. Men have this inborn sense of "knowing with", or being privy to, a code of moral conduct. Without conscience, all aspects of social life would be far more chaotic than is actually the case. To the degree that men will not obey natural law it is therefore reasonable to subject them to the artificial law that the State imposes.

But the State, which is the most complicated product of social development as yet fully achieved, has no moral sense and, in spite of its law courts and enforcement agencies, possesses no organ that can be compared with the human conscience. The Church, as distinct from the State, is of course deeply and continuously concerned with moral issues. The Church, however, no longer dominates the State, even in countries where a particular religion is legally "established". It is, for better or worse, the other way round.

Of course the State as an instrument may be utilized to forward morality, and to oppose immorality. And in doing this, whether by legislative action or executive fiat, it reflects both the influence of the individual conscience and the prevalent morality of a particular time and place. Nevertheless it remains true that the State can achieve good only by the application of coercion to its subjects. It substitutes the rigid compulsion of man-made law for the less well codified but morally more impelling influence of natural law. . . .

II

The State, in short, is the repository of physical rather than moral power. While this physical strength can be used for moral ends it can equally well be, and often has been, placed at the service of an im-

Copyright 1951 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

moral philosophy. The American case against Soviet Russia rests on the evidence that this distortion is currently dominant there. We have no case against the Russians for seeking to protect themselves against invasion of their territory. We do the same ourselves.

Although the State has no conscience its so-called "welfare" aspects substitute for the function of this organ in the social activities of the individual. To the extent that the Welfare State deprives the individual of power to do good or evil as he sees fit, there is, of course, encroachment on the sphere of personal morality, in behalf of governmentally defined morality.

In Soviet Russia, where God is virtually outlawed, this encroachment of positive law on natural law has reached the stage of almost complete substitution. In the United States there is still a valiant and partially successful effort to oppose Socialism, which may be accurately defined as the political system that seeks to take the right of moral decision from free individuals in order to vest it in officials serving the State.

It is frequently and often persuasively argued that the increasing complexity of human life, and the growing interdependence of men in modern society, makes the expansion of State authority inevitable and indeed imperative.

Much that is specious can be detected in this argument, but even if it were wholly conclusive an issue of great political and moral moment would still remain to be reconciled. Whenever and however the State assumes the power of decision there is an equivalent surrender of power on the part of the subjects. Encroachment may be on the freedom of the market, in the economic sphere; on the freedom of worship, in the religious sphere; on the freedom of criticism, in the political sphere. But fundamentally the encroachment is always on freedom, in one or another aspect of this condition for which the human being has not merely a biological but also an often passionate and deeply spiritual yearning.

Properly speaking, there is no such thing as freedom <u>from</u> something. "Freedom from fear" is a meaningless expression which, as coined by President Roosevelt, presumably means "Security from fear". Freedom, being the political condition in which the individual retains his natural power of choice, must always be <u>for</u> something. The choice of the free individual may be neither intelligent nor moral, but it is always a definite choice -- in behalf of some selected course out of the many that are usually available.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

III

It is the belief of the Socialist that it is socially advantageous when the State assumes the power of choice for the individual. Sometimes the argument is that the average person has no opportunity, and sometimes that he has no capacity, to choose wisely and well. But whether the emphasis in the argument is humanitarian or autocratic, the net result of its successful application is the same. The power in the people is contracted and the power of the State is enlarged.

Much more is involved here than the amount of spending power left to the taxpayer after Big Government has taken its ever-increasing slice. The power of the individual to act as his conscience dictates is also taken from him by the State. Government may, because of the heritage of freedom, be patient and relatively gentle with the conscientious objector. It may, when the political heritage is tyrannical, dispose of him by the firing squad. But either way his right to follow the dictates of conscience is called in question.

Since the State does not and cannot possess the organ of conscience, and since the individual conscience alone gives human life a moral direction, it follows that the enlargement of State power is necessarily at the expense not only of freedom, but also of morality. This means that the Socialist, whether he realizes it or not, has actually a very low regard for the human race. The criticism that he lavishes on "Wall Street" or other products of the free enterprise system is basically a criticism of the concept of freedom. Only those who do not really believe in human decency can possibly argue consistently that the freedom of individuals should be contracted by enlarging the power of officialdom. Only those who regard the human conscience as a wholly ineffective instrument would lessen its authority in behalf of a political organism that has no conscience. . . .

IV

All this consideration has a very real bearing on the subject of foreign policy, in every age and at any place.

Although the State is an amoral instrumentality, without a conscience and with no inherent sense of right and wrong, its actions towards its subjects are always to some extent restrained and guided by the prevalent morality of the people. The most complete autocrat must give consideration to the inborn sense of justice and decency among those over whom he rules. . . .

In dealings with other sovereignties, however, political rulers have never been and are not now influenced by ethical considerations as

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

such. Rulers raise no taxes from those outside the area of their control and therefore have no politically compelling reason to treat the subjects of other sovereigns with respect. It is not that the ruler is less humanitarian in his instincts or more immoral in his behavior than any other individual. But having the responsibility of the State on his shoulders, the tendency is to put what seems to be its immediate interest above all other considerations. . . .

The absence of any ethical content in foreign policy during time of war is too obvious to need much citation or emphasis. Many would be inclined to discount this characteristic, however, by saying that war represents a breakdown, rather than an aspect, of foreign policy, and by asserting further that even in wartime the chief executive of a democratic nation is under constitutional restraints which tend to check immoral conduct on his part.

Unfortunately, both qualifications are more apparent than real. The President of the United States is nominally subject to many Constitutional restraints, in time of war as well as in time of peace. However, aside from the indication that the United States can now be plunged into a major war, as in Korea, by Presidential edict, it is also clear that during the fighting foreign policy decisions of the greatest moment will be made by the President alone. As Mr. Roosevelt said, reporting on a selected part of the Yalta Agreement to Congress on March 1, 1945, the formula for the future of Poland was "agreed to by Russia, by Britain and by me" (emphasis supplied). Neither the Polish nor the American -- nor incidentally the British and Russian -- peoples had any say in the matter.

As against the theory that war is a mere interruption of the normal conduct of foreign policy, one recalls the aphorism of von Clausewitz, to the effect that war has always been definitely an instrument of national policy and that peacetime diplomacy only fills in the chinks until the time has come for the State to strike with military force. Certainly in the Prussian tradition, from Hegel on, there is little to indicate that peace is the normal condition of a nation, war a mere unfortunate aberration. Though Prussia is destroyed, the "Prussian doctrine" of Nietzsche -- that the State is "beyond good and evil", determining morals for itself -- is today stronger than ever before.

Reprinted from Chapter IV of The Foreign Policy of the United States, by Felix Morley, by permission of Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 501 Madison Avenue New York 22. Published November 12, 1951.

Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue, N. W., Washington 6, D. C. Trial subscription, three months for $3. Six months, $5.50. One year, $10. Two years, $18. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) one year, $12.00; foreign (regular mail) one year, $11. Foreign airmail rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscriptions or change of address to become effective.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Not Merely Gossip *A Supplement to* Human Events '51 Vol. VIII, No. 47

By Frank C. Hanighen November 21, 1951

WHO LIKES IKE? The Eisenhower-for-President campaign was finally launched by its manager, Senator Lodge, last Saturday in Washington. The Senator talked in brave terms, but several things still hung in the air: (1) search by correspondents failed to discover any actual headquarters; (2) there were no funds, no treasury -- a fact that Lodge admitted; and (3) most important of all, there was no public declaration from the General as to his party affiliation. The latter fact looms as perhaps the most potent handicap of the movement.

Old political observers here are not satisfied with Senator Lodge's statement: "I know he (Eisenhower) is a Republican." These observers remark that this is not enough for the cold-eyed politicos throughout the country, and among the delegates who have the responsibility for nominating a candidate. Those politicos, it is pointed out, will surely put the following embarrassing question: "But why doesn't Ike say he's a Republican?" Senator Lodge would doubtless reply that Ike is a General, in active service, and does not want to make any "political statement".

Yet that will not quench the curiosity of the GOP politicians. They will surely remark that Gen. MacArthur who was the subject of a draft movement in 1948, did not conceal the fact that he was a Republican. As a matter of fact, reports we get from various states emphasize that this very point is sticking in the throats of delegates whom Lodge is urging to join the cheer of "We like Ike."

Additionally, the leaders of the draft-Ike movement do not carry a great deal of weight with the GOP politicians. First of all, Senator Lodge is up for re-election in Massachusetts next year. It is well known that this seat is marked "doubtful" in estimates of chances in '52 Senatorial contests. Lodge was elected in the GOP landslide of 1946.

As for another booster, Senator Duff, it is not believed that he can swing any substantial group of delegates from his state of Pennsylvania. It is recalled that even in '48, when Duff was Governor of Pennsylvania, he could deliver no more than 28 out of Pennsylvania's 72 delegates to the convention. All reports from Harrisburg suggest that it is very doubtful that the present Governor, John Fine, will collaborate with the Senator.

Chairman Harry Darby, a well-liked and able man, suffers from his former association with the Dewey campaign in 1948. It is noticed, also, that Darby's utterances on the chances of Eisenhower are a bit on the cautious side.

* * * * *

TAFT'S ADVISER: Candidate Taft -- we learn from sources inside the Taft camp -- has taken as his principal adviser in the field of foreign affairs, Mr. Norman Armour, until very recently Ambassador to Venezuela. Senator Brewster of Maine, one of Taft's most active adherents, flew to Caracas several months ago and prevailed on Armour to accept this key position. Then Armour resigned from his post and returned to this country to assist the Senator from Ohio in his campaign. (We have not been able to confirm rumors that Armour worked on the editing of Taft's book on foreign policy.) Thus, Armour will be to Taft what John Foster Dulles was to Candidate Tom Dewey in 1948.

But there's an important difference. Dulles was comparatively unskilled in the field of foreign affairs. Armour, on the other hand, brings to the Taft cause some forty years of experience as a career diplomat. Ambassador to Spain, Venezuela and

Copyright 1951 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Argentina, he also served in Japan, Canada and various European posts, with a number of periods of service in the State Department in Washington. We asked one formerly prominent Ambassador for his opinion of Armour. He said: "You can classify him with Joseph C. Grew and William Phillips as representing the finest American traditions among our diplomats in our time. He certainly is not of the school of thought exemplified by Dean Acheson and Philip Jessup. He always took a realistic attitude, rather than a ideological one, towards Russia -- which may account for the fact that the Roosevelt and Truman Administration never utilized his talents in the shaping of high policy."

* * * * *

MCCARTHY: The Senator from Wisconsin continues to exert great power in behalf of his Party, despite many assertions (mainly from New Deal columnists) to the contrary and despite timidity among high members of the GOP. Recently we received, from a source in position to know the facts, a report concerning a meeting of certain Republican leaders in the West. Some of these leaders demanded that the Party, and Taft especially, "throw Joe to the dogs". If not, said these individuals, then funds would not be forthcoming for Taft from Eastern financial circles. But others present opposed this course, claiming that McCarthy is a great vote-getter for the Party. The matter was left in abeyance. But after an event which occurred on November 6, we have heard no more urging that McCarthy be sacrificed.

For McCarthy's part in two campaigns does emphasize the fact that he is certainly no liability:

(1) The by-election in the 3rd Ohio (Dayton) Congressional District was an eye-opener. The Republican candidate, Paul Schenck, had run against Representative Breen (Democrat) in 1950 and despite the great victory for Taft in Ohio that year, Schenck was defeated by about 16,000 votes. Breen resigned some months ago, and Jesse Yoder, Democrat, was put in the by-election against Schenck. There was much doubt in high GOP circles that Schenck could win. Shivers ran down the spines of some Republicans when Schenck endorsed McCarthy, saying "he had done a swell job", and the Democratic press accepted this challenge. But when the votes were counted, Schenck had won by about 13,000 -- a turnover of nearly 30,000 votes in his favor since 1950.

(2) Another straw in the wind -- McCarthy made speeches in Indianapolis in favor of the Republican candidate for Mayor this past fall. The candidate won.

Whatever else may be read into these results, it is now clear as crystal that Joe is no handicap to GOP candidates.

Meanwhile, McCarthy is not doing badly in the incessant controversy over his charges of Communism in Government. Followers of the controversy in the magazines could hardly fail to be influenced by the Time affair. Time magazine recently ran a long piece on McCarthy, and a very adverse piece it was. But the Senator popped up with some information which was most embarrassing to the editors and their publisher, Mr. Henry Luce. Time had indicated that McCarthy had falsely accused one Gustavo Duran, a Spaniard, formerly with the State Department. McCarthy said Duran had been a Communist agent; Time said that to the contrary he was anti-Communist. Then McCarthy said he had an interoffice memo from the Time bureau in Washington which called Duran everything else but an "anti-Communist". Time did not deny this. The Duran affair is of no mere academic importance for Duran is now in a key position in the United Nations organization.

* * * * *

ATROCITY: When the news from Korea about the murder of approximately 5,000 American soldiers appeared in the papers, Secretary Acheson contacted the Defense Department. We learn from reliable sources that the Secretary expressed his deep concern lest this news impede the cease-fire negotiations in Korea.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In any case, what percolated from the Executive Department here -- in the form of briefing or off-the-record conversations -- was less of indignation and horror at the atrocity, than curiosity as to how this news had been released; less a feeling of the incongruity of negotiating with enemy Generals deserving of the name of "war criminal" than of impatience with the U.S. Colonel who unbared the facts and figures of the atrocities. Meanwhile, it was noted that no expression of digust or reprobation came from the Governments of our gallant Allies, Britain and France. Finally, Senator Johnson (Colorado) has pointed out bitterly that the UN has failed to protest these atrocities. We weep alone.

Probably the best comment and analysis of the affair came from Spike (Frazier) Hunt, long-time expert on foreign affairs, who broadcasts on the Liberty network. Referring to the atrocities on our men captured by the Japs when the war broke out, he said, "Early in the Pacific war in 1942, a few American prisoners escaped from Jap war-prison camps. They were immediately put under the most extreme ban of complete secrecy, by the White House and the War Department. The reason was, that if the American public learned of these inhuman crimes, they would demand a real effort be made, in the Western Pacific war, and a little less effort put behind Russia and England. Today much the same thing has happened. This surprised and pained reaction by the Army heads, this phony innocence, this fake talk that the high brass in the Pentagon knew nothing of these atrocities -- is pure deception. Of course they knew about it -- and of course they had carefully ordered it all put under the ban of secret and restricted material."

RED AND GREEN: The colored circular enclosed herewith is a reminder that if you haven't as yet sent in your Christmas Gift Subscriptions to HUMAN EVENTS, now is the time to do so.

THE FREE MARKET: In Mexico, we are told, bribery is an established and highly respected institution. The citizen knows just what he is expected to pay for the privilege of circumventing the law; and he knows that there is a law he must circumvent, for the officials have carefully and considerately covered with a prohibitory law every situation that might arise in a man's life. The whole thing is regularized and a man knows how to get along.

What with the protest being raised in this country over irregularities in the collection of income taxes, why not adopt the Mexican pattern and be done with the nuisance? It would be a great saving to the gocvernment if we had a free market in bribes, for that would do away with investigations, law suits and the necessity of finding new rascals to replace discharged ones.

* * * * *

BOOK NOTES: John T. Flynn's new book, While You Slept (Devin-Adair), has had an advance sale of 10,000 copies.

Two Government publications worthy of perusal: (1) The first book of the Hearings of the McCarran Internal Security Committee, entitled Institute of Pacific Relations, Part I. Here you will find many things which were glossed over or left out of the press accounts during last summer's hearings. To get copies, (no charge) write to the Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C.; or to the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

(2) We have received a number of inquiries about the report mentioned in our item "Watch For" in the issue of October 24. Copies of the report (entitled "The Maryland Election of 1950") may be obtained from the Government Printing Office or from Senator William E. Jenner, Senate Office Building. No charge for copies.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Book Events

William Jay Gaynor, Mayor of New York, by Mortimer Smith. Chicago: Henry Regnery Company. $2.50. Reviewed by Frank Chodorov.

Imagine this. Mr. Truman is asked by a correspondent, "What would you say to the readers of our 3,000 newspapers?" The President replies, "I would say to them to be very careful about believing all they see in the newspapers." That is just as inconceivable as his saying to a reporter who had presented his press card, "Never heard of you. I suggest you get the hell off my front porch."

Yet, a man who held a job often considered second in importance to the Presidency, the Mayoralty of New York, said exactly that. He said much so out of line with what is deemed politically prudent that one wonders how he ever got into office. For instance, you would not expect a prospective candidate (which is what every officeholder is) to explain that monopolies originate "in laws we have passed instead of in any failure to pass laws". Or, how would it go with the present Mayor of New York if he told its denizens that "if people of a city are generally ignorant, base or corrupt, they will have that kind of government?"

Forty years ago the newspaper columns of New York were enlivened with such straightforward, impolitic, but always well-turned, phrases from the pen of its unusual executive. Quite a few of them, but not enough, add relish to the delightful essay, William Jay Gaynor, Mayor of New York, by Mortimer Smith. The contrast between these Gaynoresque opinions and the hedgings that characterize statements from run-of-the-mill politicians is a source of constant amazement to the reader. It does not seem possible that an American officeholder could display such intellectual integrity.

But, then, Gaynor came by these qualities quite easily because he was possessed of both a philosophy of living and a philosophy of government. His facility of expression stemmed not only from his learning, which was considerable, but more so from a body of principles that gave positive direction to his thought. As an intransigent individualist he could do nothing less than inform an aldermanic investigating committee: "I do not propose to be Mayor and have someone else run the city. If it is run badly, here is the man that is responsible -- just look at me." As a liberal -- before the word was perverted into its opposite -- it was natural for Gaynor to say that "the source of all progress lies in the free exercise of individual energy". As a Democrat of Jeffersonian persuasion, he came easily to this statement: "This question of interfering with business, either in the way of passing statutes to curb or expand it, is a false principle. The law should leave all business free, with no favor to anyone, and the government should keep its hands off."

It is no detraction from the skill of the author to say that with a character so constructed his story had to be interesting. Fortunately, Mr. Smith lets the story tell itself. He makes no pretense at psychological analysis -- that obscene affectation of many modern biographers, which is assumed not for the purpose of explaining their subjects but rather to parade their own superficial erudition -- but describes his character in terms of his known behavior and published statements: regardless of what made this personality "tick", he is worth knowing. To be sure, as Mr. Smith says, Gaynor's reticence about his private affairs -- very little is known of his life before he entered the public service -- makes any presumptive attempt to explain him psychologically futile. It was just like this intransigent individualist to keep from the prying eye of curiosity those matters which concerned him and not the public; the only thing they ought to know is what he thought, and of that he told them plenty.

"It seems certain that today", Mr. Smith writes, ruefully, "a man of his intellectual bent would find it almost impossible to be nominated for any public office." But, that was true in Gaynor's time; how many of his type ever got through the political machine unscathed? Gaynor's advent was something of a phenomenon.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED